DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 732 SP 007 713

AUTHOR	Castiglione, Lawrence V.
TITLE	Potential Mobility Among Career Teachers in New York City's Middle Schools: The Relationship Between Selected Occupational Characteristics, Expectations and Attitudes.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	United Federation of Teachers, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Jun 68
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Faculty Mobility; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Guidance; Teacher Motivation; Teacher Promotion; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	New York City

ABSTRACT

To determine the relationship between selected occupational characteristics and attitudes of New York City middle-school teachers and their potential mobility within the system, a 33-item questionnaire was distributed to all teachers in a random sample of 12 junior high schools and four middle schools. The questionnaire was designed to obtain data for classifying respondents as classroom and career teachers, determine respondents' opinions and the degree to which these opinions influenced their potential mobility, and elicit suggestions for reducing teacher mobility. It was found that the potentially mobile teacher feels that he a) teaches in a school with frequent discipline problems, b) teaches in a school where the staff views the pupils as having little educational potential, and c) received inadequate support from the school administration. Respondents recommended that in order to reduce mobility a) preservice preparation programs that present a realistic view of the teaching profession should be developed; b) supervisors should guide and assist teachers rather than evaluate them; c) parents and teachers should be included in the policy-making process; and d) parents should be hired as classroom aides. The results of the survey are equivocal because only 17.75% of the random sample responded. It is therefore recommended that caution be exercised in generalizing the results and that the study be replicated using a more adequate sample. (HMD)

ED 087732

POTENTIAL MOBILITY AMONG CAREER TEACHERS IN NEW YORK CITY'S MIDDLE SCHOOLS: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS, EXPECTATIONS AND ATTITUDES

By

Lawrence V. Castiglione

Director of Research
Department of Education

Queens College, City University of New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 007 713

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Acknowledgments	1
Introduction by Toby K. Kurzband	2
The Problem	4
Procedure in Collecting Data	5
The Data	8
Teachers' Comments and Recommendations	24
Summary and Conclusions	29
Appendix	32
Bibliography	39

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are due to Miss Madeline Morrissey and Dr. Joseph Justman of the New York City Board of Education, Bureau of Research, and to those middle school teachers whose cooperation made this study possible--in particular, Mr. Robert Bramms, whose advice at the start of this investigation was extremely helpful.

INTRODUCTION: ORIGIN OF THE INQUIRY

By

Toby K. Kurzband

The junior high school reputedly has the highest teacher turnover rate of any of the three levels. Why? The present inquiry grew out of the belief that the best way to find out would be to ask the teachers involved--those in the junior high and intermediate schools.

The following developments lend a special timeline to the inquiry and are indeed the direct cause of its having been undertaken. In April 1965 the Board of Education passed a resolution to reorganize the three levels of the school system into a 4-4-4 plan, as recommended by the Allen Committee. A number of problems promptly presented themselves. The establishment of a four-year comprehensive high school hinged on the availability of space in the existing high schools and the rapidity with which new ones could be built. An initial move to transfer as many ninth-grade students as possible into the high schools led to the creation of new combinations of grades in some junior high schools: 5-8, 6-8, 7-8, and 5-9.

To determine what changes were needed to make this new organization most effective, 14 schools were designated as pilot intermediate schools. The late Dr. Joseph Loretan assembled an Intermediate School Committee consisting of principals and teachers from the junior high and elementary schools and personnel from the various divisions of the Board of Education and from a number of colleges and universities. Although this committee considered many problems posed by the organization of this new school structure, including curriculum, scheduling, programing, facilities, and evaluation, it soon became apparent that one of the most urgent problems was that of staffing.

College personnel on the committee faced the problem of recruiting new teachers for the intermediate schools from among their graduates, while groups like the United Principals Association recommended that the intermediate schools look to the teachers with common branches licenses in the elementary schools as more likely recruits. The further the problem of retraining the teachers who might be persuaded to remain in the truncated junior high schools or new intermediate schools also occupied the attention of the committee.

The Center for Urban Education became involved in this challenging problem when I (as a consultant on teacher education for the Center and as a member of the Board of Education's Intermediate School Committee) arranged a seminar for college and Board of Education personnel in March 1966 and another one the following month.

Since the United Federation of Teachers is vitally concerned with staffing problems, the idea for this inquiry was discussed with Albert Shanker, president of the UFT. A grant from the Executive Committee of the UFT permitted Professor Lawrence Castiglione, Director of Educational Research at Queens College, to prepare a questionnaire to be submitted to teachers. The following paper by Professor Castiglione incorporates and interprets his findings.

THE PROBLEM

This investigation was designed to assess relationships between selected occupational characteristics, expectations and attitudes of New York City middle school teachers and potential mobility within the New York City school system.

Definition of Terms

The terms used in this investigation are defined as follows:

Middle schools refer to both intermediate and junior high schools in New York City.

Classroom teachers are operationally defined as respondents who answered "yes" to the question, "Are you on the instructional staff and carrying at least half of the normal program, instructing students face-to-face in one or more grades?" (See Appendix: Questionnaire, Part I, Item 3).

Career teachers are operationally defined as classroom teachers whose questionnaire responses indicate that they intend to remain classroom teachers for the next ten years. (See Appendix: Questionnaire, Part I, Item 7).

Potentially mobile career teachers are operationally defined as respondents, classed as career teachers, who have indicated that the likelihood that they will seek reassignment to another school is at least equal to the likelihood that they will not seek reassignment to another school. (See Appendix: Questionnaire, Part I, Item 10).

Attitudes toward selected occupational problems are operationally defined as the extent to which respondents agreed or disagreed with the opinion statements on the questionnaire concerning occupational problems of teachers.

PROCEDURE IN COLLECTING DATA

Methodology

The population of interest in this investigation consisted of all middle school teachers in New York City. A sample of 12 junior high schools and four intermediate schools was randomly selected from the junior high schools and intermediate schools in four boroughs of the city (excluding only the borough of Richmond), and questionnaires were distributed to each of the teachers in these schools.

The United Federation of Teachers, Division of Research, sent a letter to the chapter chairman in each of the selected schools explaining the study and requesting distribution and collection of the questionnaires. This was followed by a telephone call explaining in some detail the nature and purposes of the study, in an attempt to insure cooperation.*

Questionnaires were mailed to the UFT chapter chairmen from the Center for Urban Education. Completed questionnaires were returned to the Center by the chapter chairmen, who were then reimbursed for the cost of postage. Returned questionnaires were inspected to determine completeness, and the data cards were punched directly from the pre-coded questionnaires.

The percentage of returns was unexpectedly low, despite the efforts of Mr. John O'Neal, of the UFT Junior High School Division, and those of the investigator. The possibility of systematic bias in this data was

---

*Each chapter chairman was told that the study was supported by the United Federation of Teachers and was being carried out through the Center for Urban Education. It was explained that neither the individuals nor the schools in the sample would be identified, and that copies of the final research report would be sent to each of the chapter chairmen in the participating schools. Every teacher in each of the schools was to receive a questionnaire.

increased by the fact that failure of an automatic collating machine resulted in the distribution of questionnaires with one page missing to at least two schools. These incomplete questionnaires had to be excluded from the data, thus further reducing the number of useable questionnaires. Furthermore, five schools did not respond at all. In ten of the remaining 263 questionnaires there were responses omitted on items used to classify respondents. These questionnaires also had to be dropped from the sample. The final sample of 253 respondents represents 17.75 per cent of the 1,425 teachers in the original sample.*

As a result, the data of this investigation are equivocal and may be said to represent only the opinions of those teachers who chose to respond.

The Questionnaire

A three-part questionnaire was developed to meet the specific needs of this investigation. Part I, consisting of 12 items, was designed to elicit the descriptive data needed for classifying respondents as classroom teachers and career teachers. Two items in this selection provided data on the likelihood of respondents requesting transfer to another school and the direction of potential mobility in terms of the educational level preferred.

Part II of the questionnaire consisted of 19 pairs of items in a Likert-type format. (See Bibliography: Kerlinger, F.N.). Each pair included an opinion statement to which the teacher responded by indicating

*This figure, based on the October 1967 school payrolls, is used as an estimate of the number of teachers in the sample schools at the time of the questionnaire distribution.

the extent of his agreement or disagreement on a scale ranging from +3 (very strongly agree) to -3 (very strongly disagree) and a question asking the respondent to indicate the effect of this opinion on his desire to continue teaching in his present school, using a scale ranging from +3 (very strong positive influence) to -3 (very strong negative influence). A zero was used to indicate no influence. Items were mechanically recoded on a 1 through 7 scale, 1 representing -3, and 7 representing a response of +3.

The pairing of items of Part II of the questionnaire was suggested by Mori's (1965) Teacher Motivation Scale. The content of items 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 15 and 16 is drawn from Mori's work. The remaining items were based on interviews and discussions with intermediate and junior high school teachers, UFT personnel, and personnel from the Bureau of Research of the New York City Board of Education.

Part III of the questionnaire consisted of two open-ended items designed to elicit comments and suggestions about what might be done to reduce teacher mobility in the middle schools and to provide an opportunity for teachers to comment on the questionnaire itself.

Item reliability could not be established because of the difficulties encountered in collecting the data, but an estimate of item reliability was obtained by calculating the mean of the sums of squares of the factor loadings(h^2) of all 41 variables in the unrotated factor matrix. Since the reliability of an item is at least equal to its h^2, a lower bound estimate of item reliability of the factored items was derived. This mean was found to be .467. When the same procedure was applied to the items on which there were significant differences between the means of potentially mobile and potentially stabile career teachers, the mean item reliability estimate was found to be .577.

THE DATA

Occupational Characteristics and Expectations

Table 1 shows that approximately 6 per cent of the respondents were not classroom teachers as defined in this investigation, approximately 93 per cent were classed as classroom teachers, and approximately 1 per cent of the respondents did not answer the question.

TABLE 1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS DEFINED AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS

	Number	Per cent
Classroom teachers.....	236	93.28
Not classroom teachers.....	15	5.93
No response.....	2	.79
	253	100.

Table 2 shows that 50 per cent of the 236 classroom teachers indicated that they intended to remain classroom teachers for the next ten years. These are the career teachers of this study.

Approximately 18 per cent of the remaining classroom teachers indicated that they intended to enter administration, approximately 11 per cent intended to enter supervision, and approximately 17 per cent were classed under the category "other", which included teachers who expect to retire, leave the system, or take an examinination in an educational specialty such as corrective reading.

TABLE 2

PROFESSIONAL PLANS OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

	Number	Per Cent
Continue teaching	118	50.00
Enter administration	42	17.80
Enter supervision	27	11.44
Other	41	17.37
No response	8	3.39
	236	100.

These data correspond reasonably well to those reported in the Griffiths, et al. (1963, p. 52) study of teacher mobility. In that investigation, 174 junior high school teachers were interviewed as part of a sample that included all educational levels, from elementary school through senior high school. In response to a question regarding their professional plans for the next five years, 59.8 per cent planned to continue teaching, 13.8 per cent planned to enter administration, and the remaining 26.4 per cent planned to leave teaching, retire, teach elsewhere, leave the system and return later, or were undecided.

The data of Table 3 indicate the extent to which one variable, the difference in salary, contributes to the decision to leave teaching.

TABLE 3

CLASSROOM TEACHERS PLANNING ON ENTERING ADMINISTRATION OR SUPERVISION WHO WOULD REMAIN TEACHERS IF SALARIES WERE COMPARABLE TO POSITION SOUGHT

	Number	Per cent
Would remain a teacher if salary were comparable to administrative position.....	36	52.17
Would seek administrative or supervisory position even if teachers' salaries were comparable.....	31	44.93
No response.....	2	2.90
	69	100.

Slightly over one-half of the classroom teachers who indicated their intention to pursue a career in administration or supervision felt that they would remain teachers if teachers' salaries were comparable to those of the administrative or supervisory positions they intended to seek. That approximately 45 per cent indicated that they would seek a different role in education even if there were no substantial increase in salary is perhaps more surprising than that 52 per cent would choose to remain teaching, since the difficulties in preparing for license examinations are well known. (Griffiths et al., 1963). Had a greater number of questionnaires been returned, the two groups would have been compared with regard to other variables, such as years of experience and kind and type of license, in order to bring to light possible differences that might have suggested an explanation for these data.

Table 4 shows that the career teachers in this study less frequently intended to seek reassignment to another school than did other school personnel.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES OF CAREER TEACHERS TO ALL OTHER RESPONDENTS REGARDING THE LIKELIHOOD OF SEEKING REASSIGNMENT TO ANOTHER SCHOOL

	Potentially Mobile			Potentially Stabile			
	Certainly will	Probably will	Chance even	Probably would not	Certainly would not	No responses	Total
Career teachers							
Number	10	15	25	42	24	2	118
Per cent	8.47	12.71	21.19	35.59	20.34	1.69	99.99*
All other respondents							
Number	22	18	29	49	14	3	135
Per cent	16.30	13.33	21.48	36.30	10.37	2.22	100
x^2	7.2369						

x^2 c. .05=2.776 df=4

* Total less than 100 per cent because of rounding error

A total of approximately 42 per cent of the career teachers were identified as potentially mobile.

The direction of mobility, or the education level of choice for these teachers, is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL PREFERRED BY POTENTIALLY MOBILE CAREER TEACHERS AND BY ALL OTHER POTENTIALLY MOBILE RESPONDENTS

	Elementary School	High School	Junior High School	Intermediate School	No Response	Total
Potentially mobile career teachers						
Number	--	34	3	13	--	50
Per cent	--	68	6	26	--	100
All other potentially mobile respondents						
Number	2	46	4	17	--	69
Per cent	2.90	66.67	5.80	24.64	--	100.01*

* Total greater than 100 per cent because of rounding error

The senior high schools seem to have the greatest attraction for potentially mobile middle school personnel.

Table 6 shows the educational levels preferred by men and women in the potentially mobile group of career teachers.

TABLE 6

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF CHOICE FOR POTENTIALLY MOBILE MEN AND WOMEN CAREER TEACHERS

	Elementary School	High School	Intermediate School	Junior High School	Total
Men					
Number	--	17	2	4	23
Per cent	--	73.91	8.70	17.39	100
Women					
Number	--	17	1	9	27
Per cent	--	62.963	3.704	33.333	100

There were no significant differences between the frequencies of potentially mobile men and women career teachers' choices of preferred educational level.

Comparison of potentially mobile career teachers' preferred educational level with their teaching license is shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF PERCENTAGES OF POTENTIALLY MOBILE CAREER TEACHERS CLASSED BY PREFERRED EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND TEACHING LICENSE

	Elementary School		High School		Intermediate School		Junior High School		Total by License	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Regular JHS License	--	--	23	46	1	2	6	12	30	60
Substitute JHS License	--	--	9	18	--	--	6	12	15	30
Regular Common Branches License	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	1	2
Substitute Common Branches License	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	1	2
Other	--	--	2	4	1	2	--	--	3	6
Total by Educational Level	--	--	34	68	3	6	13	26	50	100

Over two-thirds (68 per cent) of the potentially mobile career teachers would choose to be reassigned to high schools rather than another junior high school or intermediate school. These teachers do not all hold substitute licenses. Forty-six per cent of all potentially mobile career teachers hold regular junior high school licenses and wish to be reassigned to a high school. It is unlikely that they are "shopping around" for a place in the system. The general tendency for potentially mobile teachers to choose high schools seems to be reflected in the comments teachers made on the openended items in which they indicated expectatiors of better student-teacher relationships and increased professional status at the high school level.

Table 8 shows that potentially mobile career teachers' preferred educational levels in relation to their college training. When potentially mobile career teachers who received some college training specifically directed to middle school teaching are compared to those with none, with regard to preferred educational level, there are no significant differences between the two groups.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF THE FREQUENCY OF POTENTIALLY MOBILE CAREER TEACHERS WITH AND WITHOUT COLLEGE TRAINING SPECIFICALLY DIRECTED TO MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHING, WITH PREFERENCES REGARDING EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

	Elementary and High School Level	Intermediate and Junior High School Level	Total
Some middle school training			
Number	13	9	
Per cent	59.1	40.9	
No middle school training			
Number	21	6	
Per cent	77.78	22.22	
No response	-		
x^2	1.21 n.s.		

In Table 9, potentially mobile and potentially stabile career teachers are compared with regard to which of three educational plans they preferred. The differences of choices between the two groups are statistically significant. The potentially mobile career teachers favor the 8-4 plan more frequently than do the potentially stabile career teachers. But some valuable insights can be gained by examining the preferences of the potentially stabile career teachers. Their first preference is the 5-3-4 plan, their second preference is the 8-4 plan, and their third is the 4-4-4 plan. The implications of the attitudes involved, and how they are shaped by the school organization, may be worth investigating.

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF MOBILE AND POTENTIALLY STABILE CAREER TEACHERS WITH REGARD TO PREFERRED EDUCATIONAL PLAN

	4-4-4 Plan	5-3-4 Plan	8-4 Plan	No Response	Total
Potentially mobile career teachers					
Number	3	19	22	6	50
Per cent	6	38	44	12	100
Potentially stabile career teachers					
Number	11	35	17	3	66
Per cent	16.67	53.03	25.75	4.55	100
x^2	6.7935				

x^2 c.05 = 5.99 for df=2

Attitudes Toward Selected Occupational Characteristics

In order to reduce a great mass of data into orderly, comprehensible relationships, the questionnaire data was factor-analyzed. The responses of all career teachers to the 38 items on Part II of the questionnaire, plus the number of years of teaching experience (Part I, Item 2, the highest grade preferred (Part I, Item 9), and the probability of seeking reassignment to another school (Part I, Item 10) were intercorrelated, using Pearson's r in a program for incomplete data. None of the n's fell below 115 or over 118 for any variable.*

The resulting 41 x 41 correlation matrix was subjected to centroid factor analysis with unity used as the estimate of commonality. Three of the nine resulting factors, accounting for 53 per cent of the total variance, were rotated, using Kaiser's verimax procedures. Rotation produced one primary and two secondary factors.

---

* The n of 118 includes two career teachers who did not respond to item 10. The r matrix and the unrotated factor matrix are to be deposited with the American Documentation Institute.

TABLE 10

VARIMAX ROTATION OF FIRST THREE FACTORS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Variable Item Numbers	I	II	III	h^2
6B	.7036	.2711	-.0865	.5760
9B	.6662	.3029	.0187	.5359
6A	.6190	.2937	-.0957	.4786
9A	-.6074	-.2145	-.0648	.4192
10 Part I	.5845	.0417	.1416	.3634
7B	.5724	-.0098	.0339	.3289
4B	.5719	.1158	.2694	.4131
3B	.5102	-.1070	.4407	.4659
7A	-.4822	-.0426	-.1108	.2466
4A	.4751	.0491	.2638	.2977
8B	.4642	.1881	-.1016	.2612
8A	-.4365	-.1162	.0670	.2086
3A	.4340	-.1231	.3934	.3582
10A	-.3752	-.2473	-.0121	.2021
18A	.2601	-.1240	-.0362	.0843
17B	.2395	.2001	-.0655	.1017
17A	-.1678	.0328	.0958	.0384
12A	-.1655	.1101	.0570	.0428
9 Part I	-.1587	-.1064	.0219	.0370
2 Part I	.1249	.0239	.0490	.0186
5B	.1190	.5717	.0631	.3449
14A	.0685	.4875	.0736	.2477
19B	.0219	.4689	.1813	.2532
13B	.0403	.4618	-.0171	.2152
15B	.2909	.4451	.0988	.2925
14B	.1831	.4276	.1328	.2340
10B	.3494	.4146	-.0377	.2955
5A	-.0299	.4036	.0781	.1699
13A	-.0833	.3723	-.0265	.1462
1B	.1629	.2989	.1041	.1267
12B	.0910	.2950	.1381	.1143
19A	.0604	.2915	.1131	.1014
16A	-.0506	.1740	.6717	.4840
16B	-.0360	.3094	.6349	.5001
15B	.0716	.3179	.5050	.3612
15A	.0332	-.1143	-.4158	.1870
11A	-.1666	-.0887	.3806	.1805
2B	.1853	.0338	.3774	.1779
11B	.0952	.0161	.3425	.1266
2A	-.0452	-.1134	.2154	.0613
1A	-.0569	.0244	.2141	.0497
Per cent of common variance	.4687	.2868	.2445	1.0000

There were no independent criteria against which the factors extracted might be validated. The number of responses to questionnaires sent to teachers from the sample schools who had been reassigned to other New York City schools were too few to be analyzed. Thus, the factors were named only on the basis of the content of the items that define them.

Item 10 in Part I of the questionnaire, requiring respondents to estimate the likelihood of their requesting reassignment to another school was a critical variable in this investigation and was used to identify Factor I as a stability-mobility factor. This item had its highest loading on Factor I and negligible loadings on the other two factors. Two groups, potentially mobile and potentially stabile career teachers, were established, and "t" tests were performed to determine the significance of the differences between the means of the two groups on each of the remaining forty variables. Of the 14 variables that had their highest loading on Factor I and whose absolute values equalled or exceeded .30, the differences between the means of the two groups were found to be significant for ten variables at the .01 level of confidence and for two variables at the .05 level of confidence for a two-tailed test. In addition, the differences between the means of three other variables, items 5B, 18B, and 9 (Part I) were found to be significantly different although they had a negligible loading on Factor I. The stability-mobility factor accounted for 47 per cent of the common factor variance, thus establishing it as the primary factor in this analysis.

TABLE 11

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS OF POTENTIALLY MOBILE AND STABILE TEACHERS ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

Item		Potentially Mobile	Potentially Stabile
1. Highest grade preferred.	N.....	46	65
	X.....	9.739	8.600
	SD.....	1.612	1.309
			t=4.100**
2. Relationships between teachers and administration in this school are excellent.	N.....	50	66
	X.....	-.220	.773
	SD.....	1.833	1.813
			t=2.907**
3. The influence of teachers' views regarding administration-teacher relationships upon the desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	50	66
	X.....	.000	1.545
	SD.....	1.714	1.647
			t=4.916**
4. Opportunities for professional growth in this school are excellent.	N.....	49	66
	X.....	-.878	.152
	SD.....	1.509	1.808
			t=3.237**
5. The influence of teachers' views regarding opportunities for professional growth upon their desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	49	66
	X.....	-.510	.591
	SD.....	1.647	1.519
			t=3.708**
6. The influence of teachers' views regarding opportunities for teacher-teacher communication upon their desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	50	66
	X.....	.600	1.277
	SD.....	1.654	1.465
			t=2.159*
7. Relationships between students and teachers in this school are very satisfactory.	N.....	50	66
	X.....	-.780	.242
	SD.....	1.866	1.710
			t=3.065**

TABLE 11 (cont.)

	Item		Potentially Mobile		Potentially Stabile
8.	The influence of teachers' views regarding relationships between students and teachers upon their desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	50		66
		$\bar{X}$.....	-.640		1.000
		SD.....	2.164		1.701
				t=4.571**	
9.	Discipline problems very frequently cause difficulties for teachers in this school.	N.....	50		66
		$\bar{X}$.....	2.020		1.273
		SD.....	1.696		1.697
				t=2.348*	
10.	The influence of teachers' views regarding discipline problems upon their desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	50		66
		$\bar{X}$.....	-1.000		.076
		SD.....	2.020		1.639
				t=3.166**	
11.	The influence of teachers' views regarding the educational potential of students upon their desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	50		66
		$\bar{X}$.....	-.120		.879
		SD.....	2.173		1.750
				t=2.742**	
12.	This is a "difficult" school.	N.....	50		66
		$\bar{X}$.....	.620		-.924
		SD.....	2.089		1.875
				t=4.181**	
13.	The influence of teachers' views regarding the "difficulty" of their school upon their desire to remain teaching in present school.	N.....	50		65
		$\bar{X}$.....	-.100		.969
		SD.....	1.972		1.658
				t=3.156**	
14.	The attitude of the community toward teachers in this school is very bad.	N.....	49		66
		$\bar{X}$.....	-.490		-1.288
		SD.....	1.685		1.634
				t=2.556*	

TABLE 11 (cont.)

Item		Potentially Mobile		Potentially Stabile
15. The influence of teachers' views regarding the per cent of teaching time spent in a licensed subject area upon their desire to remain teaching in their present school.	N.....	50		66
	$\bar{X}$.....	.280		1.212
	SD.....	1.928		1.593
			t=2.849**	

Note: * $P < .05$ ** $P < .01$

Items having their highest loading on Factor I (equaling or exceeding .30, absolute value) related to having good student-teacher relationships, teaching in a school that is not considered difficult, there being little likelihood of seeking reassignment to another school, the absence of discipline problems, good opportunities for professional growth, good relationships between teachers and administrators, teaching students whose educational potential is good, and a positive attitude toward teachers on the part of the community served.

Factor II, accounting for approximately 29 per cent of the common factor variance, may be interpreted as teachers' school-related, social professional satisfactions. Items having an absolute value of .30 or above (and their highest loading on this factor) have to do with satisfactory communications between teachers, satisfaction with the assignment of rooms and students, the extent to which one teaches "in license and on level," and the stabilizing influence of positive attitudes toward teachers on the part of the community served.

This factor is quite independent of the mobility item and suggests that the satisfaction in the social-professional domain that might be brought about by program changes or organizational changes within schools would have little influence on staff mobility if relations between teachers, students, and the administration were not improved.

Factor III accounted for 24 per cent of the common factor variance and may be interpreted as satisfaction with more tangible aspects of the school. Items having an absolute value of .30 or greater (and their highest loading on this factor) are directed to satisfaction with equipment and facilities, the adequacy of the physical environment of one's school, satisfaction with salary, and the stabilizing influence of a few non-teaching duties.

The relationships between factors and items that have loadings of .30 or greater on two factors seem to make sense. The stabilizing influence of not teaching in a school with serious problems, highly loaded (.666) on the stability-mobility factor, is in part related to the social-professional satisfaction factor, its loading on that factor equaling .302. The stabilizing influence of a good physical environment and necessary equipment and materials is related in part to the social-professional domain. Good relationships between staff and administration and the stabilizing influence of good opportunities for professional growth are related to satisfaction with the "physical" aspects of the school. This last point seems reasonable when one bears in mind the relation between teachers' requests for equipment or facilities and the function of administration with regard to such requests.

The importance of good student-teacher relationships is not unique to New York City. Similar conclusions were reached by McLaughlin and Shea (1960) in a survey of California teachers. They noted that secondary and elementary teachers shared many of the same problems, but not the same extent. Secondary teachers' job-related dissatisfactions seemed to be more concerned with relations between pupils and teachers than were those of elementary school teachers. In California, teachers generally agreed that they would be able to do a better job as teachers if the conditions they found dissatisfying were improved. Similar sentiments may be found in teachers' responses to the open-ended items in the present investigation. The teachers responding to the questionnaire thought that teacher recruitment and retention would be considerably more effective if a genuine effort were made to improve conditions.

TEACHERS' COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, comments and suggestions made by teachers in response to the open-ended items on Part III of the questionnaire have been abstracted, edited for clarity, and used to give substance and concrete meaning to the interpretation of these data and their implications.

Factor analysis of the questionnaire data resulted in one major stability-mobility factor. The items that defined the factor have substantive differences deal with satisfactions and dissatisfactions associated with classroom teaching. Although the factor is rather clear in a statistical sense, its meaning is somewhat ambiguous. Potential stability, for example, should not be interpreted as a teacher's complete satisfaction with a teaching position. One may be reluctant to request a transfer for a variety of reasons. One teacher writes:

> As a relative newcomer I am impressed by the fact that many older faculty members stay here because of seniority privileges. They have better working conditions, they have little planning to do, etc. This gives them much free after-school time to work or to prepare for another position in college teaching or in administration. If I stay, it may well be only for this reason.

Another states:

> Since I teach in one of the last remaining good junior high schools, which is also ten minutes from my home, I have no intentions of leaving it.... Although all of the inequities (negative items in the questionnaire) exist in my school, none can outweigh the fact that 75 per cent of the children come from good middle-class homes. The average reading level for eighth graders is 11.5.

This last statement is a good example of how powerful the student-teacher relationship is in influencing the decision to seek reassignment. The data of this investigation show that relations between students and teachers are quite complex, involving administration, supervision, the community, and opportunities for professional growth, all of which may interact.

The role of the teacher in relation to classroom management and discipline in class is frequently mentioned as a major concern. Teachers write that "there are too many emotionally disturbed children in the school who cannot function in a normal setting," that "schools are educational centers, not therapeutic centers," and that "problems related to staff turnover are primarily caused by nonacademically inclined pupils who, in turn, become behavior problems."

In short, the teachers' comments suggest that discipline problems account, in no small part, for mobility. To cope with the problem, they come forward with recommendations such as the following: "Programs for identifying pupils with unique problems should be improved. There should be more intensive testing and interviewing (of pupils) in the primary grades."

Teachers' comments regarding administrators and supervisors tend to focus on the part they play in relation to discipline problems. Many teachers feel that more support and assistance is needed, particularly for beginning teachers. "I think", wrote one respondent, "that the good, experienced teacher should be given the more difficult classes. Most new teachers seem to quit because of bad assignments. The principals and teachers have to be firmer. The kids get away with too much. Most kids can be good if interesting, motivating lessons are provided and discipline

is enforced..."

Other teachers have suggested "careful training (of teachers), compassionate supervision, small classes, and quick elimination of emotionally troubled children from normal schools." Public schools, however, may not select their students, and students have no choice about attending them. Willower and Jones (1963) note that under these conditions, control rather than education may become the principle aim of the school. The desire to eliminate or suspend pupils may exemplify the displacement of instructional goals by goals related to controlling students.

Some teachers suggested that a clear distinction be made between supervision and administration, the former to play an instructive and supportive role in relation to staff, and the latter to be concerned with organizational management and policy. A teacher suggested that "supervisors should spend all their time guiding teachers, the administrators handling all other issues," adding that there is a need for a "strong student teaching program designed to let aspiring teachers know what they are getting into so that supervisors would have only those desirous of such a career to guide and train."

Another teacher recommended: "Separate the functions of supervision and administration. Have supervisors teach at least one period a day, as chairmen are now doing, and hire separate career people for the role of administrator."

A third suggestion to achieve the same goal was the creation of a new position, "master teacher", with an assistant principal's salary. The master teacher would give demonstration lessons, observe teachers, especially the new ones, and hold conferences designed to aid teachers rather than chastise them.

In general, the suggested separation of administrative and supervisory roles seems to have merit; such a separation might reduce the extent to which teachers themselves are subject to aversive control. Perhaps supervisors would be less concerned with evaluating teachers and more concerned with the means of overcoming their teaching difficulties. Perhaps the "master teacher" or supporting supervisor could be involved on a part-time basis in a teacher-training program at a local college. Teachers have asked for assistance of this type and have pointed out that the lack of candor about instructional problems affects even the community's attitude toward teachers. For example, teachers write:

> The New York City Board of Education must be truthful about poor teaching conditions in many schools and cooperate with local colleges to train people to meet the real problems they will face. The United Federation of Teachers must also actively recruit and train people for the real problems, so they won't be so shocked and disillusioned when they begin teaching.
>
> Let parents help in schools, let parents observe classes, let parents help themselves through special instruction. The school problems stem, to a great extent, from the home. If parents and teachers understood each other's aims and goals, there might be better communication to the student who, in turn, would have more interest in school work.

Some teachers have suggested that community relations, along with the quality of instruction, might be improved by employing "teacher aides to assist teachers in the classroom. The aides should be members of the community. This would have a direct influence on the pupils." Another teacher recommended that "... new staff members become acquainted with the neighborhood and children before they start to teach. They should have buddy teachers who are really qualified to help them in areas of disciplines and routines as well as subject matter. They should receive old plan books as guides. They should be praised and criticized --they should not be allowed to become discouraged or disillusioned."

A note of caution was raised by one teacher who felt that "new teachers should spend more time with buddy teachers who are not simply veterans in terms of numbers of years in the system but rather teachers who take the job seriously and can communicate a sense of professionalism to the newcomers. Too often a buddy teacher ends up showing a newcomer 'the ropes,' the shortcuts, and their own sense of failure and frustration.

Opportunities for professional growth are part of the complex relationships between staff, administration, and pupils. Currently, many teachers feel that such opportunities are greater in the senior high schools. One teacher wrote, "there is too much pettiness and emphasis on 'show' in the junior high school, too much time spent on junk such as ties, bulletin boards, etc. when a teacher should be preparing a lesson. Many of us go on to high school where the discipline atmosphere is better. There is also a belittling of the teachers' position. Teachers are considered on the bottom of the totem pole and often ignored." Another teacher felt that there was a need for greater "... concern over the quality of education going on in the classroom and in the preparation done by teachers and less obsession with such things as attendance cards, truant slips, and reports of return. Newcomers soon confuse being a good teacher with being an efficient clerk."

Teachers tend to feel that they are not treated as professionals. One teacher wrote, "stop treating teachers as pieces of furniture, shifting them from one level to another. A dressmaker collects unemployment benefits if she cannot find employment requiring her special skill. Teachers spend six years in college mastering a special subject and then are required to work as babysitters, disciplinarians, and soothing syrup dispensers."

Teachers stated that they wished to participate as professionals in schools. One teacher wrote, "give teachers greater dignity as professionals. Consult them for ideas in improving curricula and discipline. Give them status

and power to act decisively in emergency situations." Another wrote, "give the staff the feeling that they, individually, are necessary to the education of the students who shall become, without doubt, dignified, successful human beings.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The data of this investigation are based on the responses of 253 respondents from nine schools, representing approximately 18 per cent of 1,425 teachers in a random sample of 12 junior high schools and four intermediate schools. Approximately 93 per cent of the respondents were identified as classroom teachers.

Approximately 50 per cent of all classroom teachers in the sample expect to continue in that role for the next ten years. These respondents are the career teachers of this study. Approximately 42 per cent of the career teachers were identified as potentially mobile by their having indicated that the likelihood of their requesting transfer to another school was 50-50, probable, or certain. The majority of the potentially mobile career teachers, approximately 68 per cent, wish to transfer to the senior high schools.

Potentially mobile and potentially stabile career teachers' responses to 41 of the questionnaire items were factor-analyzed. Rotation of three factors, accounting for 53 per cent of the total variance, produced one major factor, accounting for 47 per cent of the common factor variance, and two secondary factors. The primary factor was defined by the item requiring career teachers to estimate the likelihood of their requesting transfer to another school. Of the 14 items having their highest loadings on this factor and equalling or exceeding .30, absolute value, significant differences

existed between the means of potentially mobile and potentially stabile career teachers on 12. The "t" values of three items having a negligible loading on the primary factor were also found to be significant.

The content of significant items defining the primary factor, named the stability-mobility factor, was the interrelationship of pupils, teachers, and administrators, particularly the relationships between discipline problems, opportunities for professional growth, and administrative support. Teachers' responses to open ended items were used to provide examples and give substance to the interpretation of the data.

Factor II, accounting for 29 per cent of the common factor variance, was interpreted as teachers' school-related, social-professional satisfaction. Factor III, accounting for 24 per cent of the common factor variance, was interpreted as teachers' satisfaction with the more tangible aspects of school service. Both of these factors were relatively independent of the mobility item, indicating that they had little to do with within-system transfer of career teachers. Only two items (5B and 18B) having their highest loading on Factor II differentiated potentially mobile from potentially stabile career teachers. Item 5B referred to the influence of opportunities for between-teacher communications, and Item 18B referred to the influence of the percentage of teaching time in a licensed subject.

Because of limitations of the sample, noted in the description of the methodology of the study, the data are equivocal and may not represent the opinions of the majority of middle school teachers. Caution should therefore be exercised in generalizing the results of this investigation to the larger population from which the sample was drawn. A replication of this study that would include, in addition to a more adequate sample,

several methods of factor extraction and comparison of their results, would be extremely useful.

In conclusion, the several interrelated variables associated with career teachers' transfers at the middle school level, when taken together, present a picture of the potentially mobile teacher as teaching in a "difficult" school, a school in which teachers frequently experience discipline problems, a school in which pupils are viewed by the teachers as having little educational potential, and exacerbating this unrewarding situation, inadequate assistance or support from the school administration. These circumstances are viewed as offering little opportunity for professional growth. A majority of potentially mobile career teachers expect to escape these conditions by transferring to a senior high school.

It would be interesting, in a future study, to see if teachers in the new intermediate schools find increased status and professional standing--with a resultant reduction in mobility--than is the case in our schools as presently organized.

Recommendations that may reduce the mobility rate are those that might reasonably be expected to influence the underlying problems. They are: (a) teacher preparation that includes preservice and inservice experience in schools with serious problems in programs that include experienced teachers with demonstrated competence in the instructional process; (b) a change in the role of supervision from administration and evaluation of teachers to guidance and assistance of teachers; and (c) increased involvement of teachers and parents, in an advisory capacity, in the application and development of educational policy at a local level; (d) employment of parents as teacher aides in middle school classrooms, and (e) increased recognition of teachers as professional educators, who as professionals, are responsible first to their students' needs, and second, to the organization that employs them.

APPENDIX

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y.

Dear Teacher:

There is no doubt that we must have more precise information about the occupational problems associated with teaching, if the quality of education is to be improved. What problems affect staff turnover? What factors of the teaching profession strongly influence teachers' desires to continue teaching? What problems are serious but unrelated to mobility. The United Federation of Teachers has funded this survey through the Center for Urban Education, an independent non-profit research organization, in an attempt to provide answers to these questions. This data is intended to serve as the basis for suggesting changes that may be valuable for solving teachers' problems and for guiding prospective teachers.

We would greatly appreciate your helping by answering some questions about factors influencing your desire to continue teaching in your present school. The attached questionnaire has three parts: Part 1 asks for some personal information; Part 2 is concerned with your opinions on a number of problem areas and how they influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school; Part 3 asks for your comments and recommendations with regard to the questionnaire and the reduction of staff mobility.

Please answer all the questions frankly and from your own viewpoint. The significance and accuracy of this study is dependent upon sample size and the full return of the distributed questionnaires. No names are required and none of the schools sampled will be identified. Please be sure to return your completed questionnaire to the UFT Chapter Chairman in your school. Thank you very much for your help.

Lawrence V. Castiglione
Queens College, Director of
Educational Research

The Career Teacher in the Int. School
Educational Practices, Center for Urban Education

PART I

1. What is your sex? (circle one) 1

   Male 1
   Female 2

2. Including this year, how many years of service as a teacher (both regular and substitute) have you had? ____ years. 2-

3. Are you on the instructional staff and carrying at least half of a normal program, instructing students face to face in one or more grades? (circle one) 4

   Yes..... 1
   No..... 2

4. Are you currently serving on a: (circle one) 5

   Regular Junior High School teaching license 1
   Substitute Junior High School teaching license..... 2
   Regular common branches 3
   Substitute common branches 4
   Certificate of competence 5
   Other (please state)_____

5. Please list the licenses you hold. 6

   _____

   _____

6. In college, was your course work or program specifically directed toward training middle school teachers? (circle one) 7

   Yes..... 1
   No..... 2

7. What do you see yourself doing professionally within the next ten years? (circle one) 8

   Continuing teaching 1
   Entering administration 2
   Entering supervision 3
   Other (please state) _____

8. If your answer to question (7) was 2 or 3, would you prefer to remain teaching if the salary were comparable to that of the position you may seek? (circle one) 9

Yes..... 1
No..... 2

9. What grade or grades do you prefer to teach? (Circle one) 10

K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

10. When eligible to transfer, how likely is it that you will seek reassignment to another school? (circle one) 11

Certainly will seek reassignment 1
Probably will seek reassignment 2
Chances about even, for and against 3
Probably will not seek reassignment 4
Certainly will not seek reassignment 5

11. If your answer in item (10) was either 1, 2 or 3, would you prefer to teach in: (circle one) 12

an Elementary School 1
a High School 2
an Intermediate School 3
a Junior High School 4

12. Which of the following educational plans do you prefer? (circle one) 13

4- 4- 4..... 1
5- 3- 4..... 2
8- 4 3

Directions for Part II

Part II is composed of 19 pairs of statements and questions concerned with various opinions on occupational problems in teaching and their influence upon your desire to continue teaching in your present school. We wish you to express your opinion by agreeing or disagreeing with each of the opinions marked (A) on the following pages. Please respond to all of the statements as honestly and frankly as you can. No one will know how you respond because we are asking your not to identify yourself.

Please respond to each of the (A) items as follows:

Agree very strongly:	+3	Disagree very strongly:	-3
Agree strongly	+2	Disagree strongly:	2
Agree:	+1	Disagree:	-1

For example, if you agree very strongly with a statement, write +3 on the line preceding the statement. If you should happen to disagree with it write -1 in front of it.

Paired with each opinion statement is a question asking you to indicate the extent to which your opinion influences your desire to continue teaching in your present school. These items are marked (B). Please respond to each of the (B) items as follows:

Strong positive influence:	+3	Strong negative influence:	-3
Moderate positive influence:	+2	Moderate negative influence:	-2
Slight positive influence:	+1	Slight negative influence:	-1
		No influence:	0

For example, if your view on an opinion has a strong positive influence on your desire to continue teaching in your present school, write +3 on the on the line preceding the question. If you should feel that an opinion statement has a slight negative influence on your desire to continue teaching in your present school, write -1 in front of the question below it.

Please do not omit any items. Go rapidly but carefully. Do not spend too much time on any statement or question; try to respond and then go on. Do not sign your name.

PART II

1. (A)____ I would very much prefer to teach in a school that is closer to my home. 14

   (B)____ How does your view in item 1 (a) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 15

2. (A)_____ Demands made on teachers to perform non-teaching activities in this school are too great 16

(B)_____ How does your view in item 2 (A) influence your desire to remain teaching in this school? 17

3. (A)_____ Relationships between administration and teachers in this school are excellent 18

(B)_____ How does your view in item 3 (a) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 19

4. (A)_____ Opportunities for professional growth in this school are very good 20

(B)_____ How does your view in item a (A) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 21

5. (A)_____ Opportunities for communication between teachers in this school are very good 22

(B)_____ How does your view in item 5 (a) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 23

6. (A)_____ Relationships between students and teachers in this school are very satisfactory 24

(B)_____ How does your view in item 6 (A) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 25

7. (A)_____ Discipline problems very frequently cause difficulty for teachers in this school 26

(B)_____ How does your view in item 7 (A) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 27

8. (A)_____ The educational potential of my students is very poor 28

(B)_____ How does your view in item 8 (A) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 29

9. (A)_____ This is a very "difficult" school 30

(B)_____ How does your view in item 9 (A) influence your desire to remain teaching in your present school? 31

10. (A)_____ The attitude of the community toward teachers in this school is very bad 32

11. (B)_____ How does your view in item 10 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 33

11. (A)_____ I consider my salary very satisfactory 34

(B)_____ How does your view in item 11 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school?

2. (A)_____ The mastery of subject matter knowledge should be the major aim of instruction 36

(B)_____ How does your view in item 12 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 37

3. (A)_____ My current schedule is very satisfactory 38

(B)_____ How does your view in item 13 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school?

4. (A)_____ I am very satisfied with programming (assignments of rooms and students, etc.) in this school 40

(B)_____ How does your view in item 14 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 41

5. (A)_____ The physical environment in this school is very poor 42

(B)_____ How does your view in item 15 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 43

6. (A)_____ The equipment and facilities for instruction in this school are very good 44

(B)_____ How does your view in item 16 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 45

17. (A)_____ In general, it is very difficult to teach preadolescent children 48

(B)_____ How does your answer to item 17 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 49

18. (A)__%__ To about what percentage of your teaching time is at the educational level in which you are licensed? (Write in approximate percent). 50

(B)_____ How does your answer to item 18 (A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 51

19. (A)__%__ About what percentage of your teaching time is in a subject in which you are licensed? (Write in approximate percent). 46

(B)_____ How does your answer to item 19(A) influence your desire to continue teaching in your present school? 47

PART III

What do you feel might be done to reduce staff turnover?

What are your comments and recommendations with regard to this questionnaire?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amidon, E. and Simon, A. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction." In D. Clark, The Psychology of Education (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Balow, B. "The Emotionally and Socially Handicapped." Review of Educational Research, 36, 1 (Feb. 1966).

Bateman, B. "Learning Disorders." Review of Educational Research, 36, 1 (Feb. 1966).

Bernard, H. and Huckins, W. "Mental Hygiene as an Aspect of Educational Psychology." In Authors' Readings in Educational Psychology (Cleveland: World, 1967).

Blatt, B. "The Preparation of Special Education Personnel." Review of Educational Research, 36, 1 (Feb. 1966).

Charters, W.W. "Consequences of Educators' Social Position on the Teaching-Learning Process." In J. Roberts, School Children in the Urban Slum (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Davidson, A. and Lang, G. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings Toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior." In J. Roberts, School Children in the Urban Slum (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Frymier, J. and Wells, R. "Junior High School Students' Motivation." In H. Bernard and W. Huckins, Readings in Educational Psychology (Cleveland: World, 1967).

Glass, G. and Taylor, P. "Factor Analytic Methodology." Review of Educational Research, 36, 5 (Dec. 1966).

Gottlieb, D. "Teaching Students: The Views of Negro and White Teachers." In E. Wandt, A Cross-Section of Educational Research (New York: McKay, 1965).

Griffiths, D., et al. Teacher Mobility in New York City (New York: Center for School Services and Off-Campus Courses, New York University, 1963).

Guss, C. "How is Supervision Perceived?" In E. Wandt, A Cross-Section of Educational Research (New York: McKay, 1965).

Hay, L. "The School as a Therapeutic Community." In D. Clark, The Psychology of Education (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Hunt, D. "Adolescence: Cultural Deprivation, Poverty and the Dropout." Review of Educational Research, 36, 4 (Dec. 1966).

Jackson, P. "Alienation in the Classroom." In H. Bernard and W. Huckins, Readings in Educational Psychology (Cleveland World, 1967).

Johnson, P. "Word Relatedness and Problem Solving in High School Physics." Journal of Educational Psychology, 56, 4 (Aug. 1965).

Jones, R.S. "Instructional Problems and Issues." Review of Educational Research, 36, 4 (1966).

Kaiser, H.F. "The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis." Psychometrika, 23 (1958).

Kerlinger. F.N. Foundation of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964).

Kirkpatrick, R. "The Relationship of Job Satisfaction to Perceived Staff Promotional Policies." In Wandt, A Cross Section of Educational Research (New York: E. McKay, 1965).

Kounin, J., Friesen, W., and Norton, A. "Managing Emotionally Disturbed Children in Regular Classrooms." In Clark, The Psychology of Education (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Kounin, J., Gump, P., and Ryan, J. "Explorations in Classroom Management." In Fullager, et al., Readings for Educational Psychology (New York: Crowell, 1964).

Luchin, A. "On the Theories and Problems of Adolescence." In D. Fullager, et al., Readings for Educational Psychology (New York: Crowell, 1964).

McLaughlin, J. and Shea, J. "California Teachers' Job Dissatisfactions." California Journal of Educational Research, 1960, 11, 5 (Nov. 1960).

Mathis, C. "The Relationship Between Salary Policies and Teacher Morale." Journal of Educational Psychology, 50, 6 (Dec. 1959).

Moeller, G. and Charters, W. "Relation of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers." Administrative Science Quarterly.

Mori, T. "Analysis of Factors Influencing Motivations for Becoming a Teacher." Journal of Educational Research, 60, 4 (April 1966).

Mori, T. "Structure of Motivations for Becoming a Teacher." Journal of Educational Psychology, 56, 4 (Aug. 1965).

Otto, A. and Melby, E. "An Attempt to Evaluate the Threat of Failure as a Factor in Achievement." In D. Fullager, et al., Readings for Educational Psychology (New York: Crowell, 1964).

Peters, M. and Wattenberg, W. "Adolescence: Behavior Disorders and Guidance." Review of Educational Research, 36, 4 (Oct. 1966).

Richardson, R. and Blocker, C. "An Item Factorization of the Faulty Attitude Survey." Journal of Experimental Education, 34, 4 (Summer, 1966).

Robbins, R. and Hughs, H. "Measurement of the Attitudes of Teachers Toward Teaching as a Profession." Journal of Educational Research, 60, 6 (July-Aug. 1967, comb).

Schmuck, R. "Some Aspects of Classroom Social Climate." In D. Clark, The Psychology of Education (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Sherif, C. "Adolescence: Motivational, Attitudinal, and Personality Factors." Review of Educational Research, 36, 4 (Oct. 1966).

Skinner, B.F. "The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching." In H. Bernard and W. Huckins, Readings in Educational Psychology (Cleveland: World, 1967).

Skinner, B.F. "Why Teachers Fail." In D. Clark, The Psychology of Education (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

Terrell, G., et al. "Social Class and the Nature of the Incentive in Discrimination Learning." In J. Roberts, School Children in the Urban Slum (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1967).

White, K. "The Relation of Career Involvement to Persistence in the Teaching Profession Among Beginning Female Elementary Teachers." Journal of Educational Research, 60, 2 (Feb. 1966).

Willower, D. and Jones, R. "When Pupil Control Becomes an Institutional Theme." In E. Wandt, A Cross-Section of Educational Research (New York: McKay, 1965).

Wirkman, E.K. "Children's Behavior and Teachers' Attitudes." In Fullager, et al., Readings for Educational Psychology (New York: Crowell, 1964).

Wolpert, A. "A Survey and Analysis of the Status, Problems and Potential of Teaching as a Profession." California Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 12 No. 1 (Jan. 1961).